

REMARKS

Claims 21-50 are pending.

The Office Action rejects claims 21-50 under 35 USC§102 over Bero (US Pat. 6,769,031). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 21, 31 and 41 all recite extracting a plurality of unique identifiers from an audit file, each unique identifier corresponding to a modified or deleted domain name record within a registrar database. The Office Action refers to col. 20, lines 43-61 and Fig. 8 and 9 as supposedly showing these features. However, this text and associated figures do not include a plurality of unique identifiers extracted from an audit file, with each unique identifier corresponding to a modified or deleted domain name record. If the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is requested to point out which elements correspond to the unique identifiers, the audit file, and to point out a disclosure of extracting the unique identifiers from an audit file, and how any identifiers correspond to a modified or deleted domain name record. After reviewing the cited passages, Applicants are not able to find the recited features.

Independent claims 21, 31 and 41 further recite, for each unique identifier, determining whether a first domain name record that corresponds to the unique identifier exists within the registrar database. The Office Action refers to steps 905, 910 and 915 as supposedly showing these features. However, Bero describes these steps as determining whether the DNS information is administrative whois information, determining the current registrar for the domain name, and reading the rigistrars update file that contains update information for the whois

information. These passages from Bero do not disclose any use of a unique identifier, much less determining whether a first domain name record that corresponds to the unique identifier exists within the registrar database.

Independent claims 21, 31 and 41 further recite, for each unique identifier, determining whether a second domain name record that corresponds to the unique identifier exists within the whois database. The Office Action refers to steps 920 and 925 as supposedly showing these features. However, Bero describes these steps as determining if the update file indicates that any information has been updated, and reading the contents of the whois data file with the updated information. These passages from Bero do not disclose any use of a unique identifier, much less determining whether a second domain name record that corresponds to the unique identifier exists within the whois database.

Independent claims 21, 31 and 41 further recite, for each unique identifier, comparing the first domain name record to the second domain name record. The Office Action refers to steps 950, 960 and 970 as supposedly showing these features. However, Bero describes these steps as determining if requested DNS information is in a zone data file that has been previously read and that the update file indicates has changed, determining if the update file indicates that the requested DNS information is in a new zone data file that has not been previously read, and determining if the requested DNS information is in a previously read zone data file that the update file indicates has been removed. These passages from Bero do not disclose any use of a unique identifier, much less any comparison of first and second domain names.

For these reasons, it is submitted that claims 21, 31 and 41, and all claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by Bero. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above submitted amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims of the present application are allowable over the cited prior art. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 1/31/05

By: David J. Zibelli
David J. Zibelli
Reg. No. 36,394

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 220-4200 telephone
(202) 220-4201 facsimile